

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-14 and 21-29 are pending.

Claims 1 and 21 are independent.

Claims 2-14 and 22-29 are dependent.

Claims 15-20 and have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

All claims amendments made herein are made for the purpose of clarity with respect to the specification and drawings, and not for any reason related to any statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection is inappropriate. In the response to the previous Official Action, Applicant advised the Examiner that the recited "Optimistic Editing Model" was well known to those of ordinary skill in the art and was sometimes referred to as "Optimistic Concurrency". In fact,

"Optimistic Editing" is referred to by many synonymous terms. Some of these terms include;

"Optimistic Edit Locking" (<http://jira.xwiki.org/jira/browse/XWIKI-175>),

"Optimistic Locking" (<http://jira.xwiki.org/jira/browse/XWIKI-175>, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optimistic_concurrency_control),

"Optimistic edit-and-merge model"

(<http://www.ddj.com/architect/184415356> "MKS prefers a lock-to-edit model over the optimistic edit-and-merge model of tools like CVS"),

"Optimistic Locking Concurrency" (Mao et al, "The optimistic locking concurrency controlling algorithm based on relative position and its application in real-time collaborative editing system", Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work in Design, 26-28 May, 2004, Vol. 1), and

"Optimistic Concurrency Control"

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optimistic_concurrency_control).

Numerous authors have described the concept of an Optimistic Editing (Concurrency) Model in detail:

H.T. Kung, J.T. Robinson, "On Optimistic Methods for Concurrency Control", ACM TODS, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1981;

G. Lausen, "Concurrency control in database systems: A step towards the integration of optimistic methods and locking," Proceedings of the ACM '82 Conference, 1982, pp. 64-68); and

M. Herlihy, "Apologizing versus asking permission: optimistic concurrency control for abstract data types," ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS), Volume 15 Issue 1, March 1990, pp. 96-124).

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the meaning of the recited "optimistic editing model" and would not require additional detail to make and/or use the claimed invention. With respect to the Examiner's commentary relating to the patentability of this claimed subject-matter, Applicant respectfully submits that this commentary is misplaced. Combining this claimed subject matter with the novel and inventive subject matter recited in the base independent claims and intervening dependent claims, renders this subject matter patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that that the rejection of claims 5 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

With respect to prior art, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 14 and 21 to 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the publication entitled "Exchange 2000 Conferencing Server" ("Exchange"). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection in view of Exchange is not appropriate.

According to the Applicant's invention as defined by amended independent claim 1, Applicant provides a method for creating and managing a shared workspace in a network environment comprising the steps of creating a shared workspace accessible to participants of a scheduled meeting, categorizing data stored in the shared workspace at the time the data is input into the shared workspace using a set of defined categories associated with the shared workspace and exposing the categorized data stored in the shared workspace to each participant of the scheduled meeting accessing the shared workspace through a graphical user interface.

The graphical user interface enables each participant to input data into appropriate categories of the shared workspace and edit categorized data exposed through the graphical user interface.

Exchange discloses an extensible platform for real-time online conferencing that allows users to schedule and join conferences. As described in Chapter 2 of Exchange, when a conference is scheduled, the conference management server creates a uniform resource locator (URL) for the conference. Conference attendees are able to use the URL to access the conference. The conference management service stores all scheduled conferences in a conference calendar mailbox. This information is used to create a persistent reproduction of the conference format, structure and any additional information associated with the conferences. A data conferencing provider provides shared clipboard and whiteboard

features to enable conference participants to share applications, conduct whiteboard sessions, transfer files and chat.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Exchange does NOT teach, suggest or disclose *categorizing data stored in the shared workspace at the time the data is input into said shared workspace using a set of defined categories associated with said shared workspace*. To the contrary, the Exchange shared clipboard function allows a conference participant to use copy, cut and paste operations. The Exchange whiteboard function allows a conference participant to load or sketch diagrams, organizational charts or other graphical information in a multi-page, multi-user drawing application. These features of Exchange do NOT enable the categorization of data stored in the shared workspace *at the time the data is input into the shared workspace using a set of defined categories associated with the shared workspace* as claimed.

Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Exchange in no way teaches, suggests or discloses *a graphical user interface that enables each participant to input data into appropriate categories of the shared workspace and edit categorized data* exposed through the graphical user interface. Rather, Exchange simply teaches the loading or sketching of diagrams, organizational charts or other graphical information in a multi-page, multi-user drawing application. Exchange does NOT provide a graphical user interface that enables the *input of data into categories of the shared*

workspace as claimed. As the Examiner will appreciate, Exchange does not show each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon, distinguish patentable over Exchange and should be allowed.

Independent claim 21 defines a system for creating and managing a secure shared workspace for a scheduled meeting and recites subject matter analogous to that recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 and the claims dependent thereon, distinguish patentable over Exchange and should be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the salient claimed features of the present invention are nowhere disclosed and/or taught by the cited art, whether that art is taken individually or in combination.

In view of the extended prosecution in this case, any telephone inquiry from the Examiner to the undersigned would be welcomed.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Bauer/
Attorney for Applicant
Richard P. Bauer
Registration No. 31,588

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
East Lobby, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201